

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of October 15, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-18 and 30-33 have been canceled. Claims 19-29, and 34-43 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19, 20 and 37-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar (5,648,760) in view of King et al. (6,011,554) further in view of Tattari.

Claims 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar-King-Tattari further in view of Alperovich et al (6,119,014) further in view of Nokia 6100 User's Guide, 9351506, Issue 2.

Claims 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar-King-Tattari-Nokia further in view of Mercer et al (6,167,429).

Claims 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar (5,648,760) in view of King et al. (6,011,554) and (sic, Tattari) further in view of Alperovich et al (6,119,014).

The above rejections are respectfully traversed. As recognized in the Office Action, Kumar does not specifically teach entering characters via an alphanumeric key pad of the device and entering date and time information via the alphanumeric key pad. As recognized in the Office Action, neither Kumar or King teach a mobile telephone. While Tattari teaches a mobile telephone, Tattari does not remedy the deficiencies in the proposed combination of Kumar and King. The types of mobile telephones disclosed in the present application is directed are those that do not have a calendar application. These types of mobile telephones are typically lower cost mobile telephones. Prior to the present application, those of ordinary skill in the art ignored the lack of features of such mobile telephones due to not having a calendar application therein. On the other hand, the applicant of the present application set out to address the lack of features in such mobile

telephones and has provided, in the present application, solutions that now provide the very features previously lacking in such mobile telephones.

To facilitate prosecution, independent claim 37 has been amended to claim:

A mobile telephone comprising:
a control unit;
a reminder application stored in memory, said reminder application
~~for~~ notifying the user about the occurrence of one or more timed events,
where each timed event has an associated reminder text label and date and
time for the reminder;
a clock application stored in memory, said clock application
controlled by the control unit for providing clock information to the
reminder application; and
a user interface including a display and an alphanumeric key pad
for entering date and time information associated with a reminder text
label;
the reminder application, when activated, uses a text editor from a
message application of the telephone to provides a text editor window into
which the user through the user interface enters a reminder text label, and
a time entry window in which the user through the user interface enters a
date and time associated with the reminder text label, the control unit
adapted to execute time comparison between the clock information and the
time set for said events, and to control the issuance of a reminder alert to
an intended user once the clock information from the clock application
matches the time set for one of said events, the mobile telephone not
having a calendar application that provides for display of series of pages
showing dates.

It is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the cited art. There is no evidence or suggestion in the cited art of such a configuration. Even if the proposed combination is proper, it does not result in a "reminder application, when activated, uses a text editor from a message application of the telephone to provide a text editor window into which the user through the user interface enters a reminder text label, and a time entry window in which the user through the user interface enters a date and time associated with the reminder text label . . ."

In sum, there is no suggestion to combine the teachings of the cited art as advanced by the Examiner to provide the invention as claimed in amended claim 37, except from using the applicant's invention as a template through a hindsight

reconstruction of applicant's claims. Even if the proposed combination is proper, it does not result in the invention of claim 37, as amended. Independent claims 38, 42, 43, have been similarly amended, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 37. The dependent claims are similarly patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend, and for the additional features claimed therein.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below, should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 26, 2007

By:



Robert H. Resis
Registration No. 32,168